United Nations E/CN.18/2015/12

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
31 March 2015

Original: English

United Nations Forum on Forests
Eleventh session
New York, 4-15 May 2015
Item 5 of the provisional agenda*
Enhanced cooperation and policy and programme coordination, including the provision of further guidance to the Collaborative Partnership on Forests

Note verbale dated 23 March 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

The Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General and has the honour to transmit the final report of the United Nations Forum on Forests country-led initiative entitled "Interlaken+10: workshop on governing forest landscapes — lessons learned from 10 years of experience and the way forward post-2015" (see annex).**

In the light of the importance of the report and its relevance to the work of the United Nations, in particular in the environmental field, the Permanent Mission would appreciate it if the present note and the report were issued as a document of the United Nations Forum on Forests.

* E/CN.18/2015/1.
** The annex is being circulated in the language of submission only.

15-05195 (E) 090415

Please recycle

Annex to the note verbale dated 23 March 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

INTERLAKEN+10

Workshop on Governing Forest Landscapes:

Lessons learnt from 10 years of experience and the way forward post-2015

3-6 February 2015

A Country-led Initiative (CLI) in support of the United Nations Forum on Forests

http://unff-interlaken10.org

Summary

This country-led Initiative (CLI) in support of the United Nations Forum on Forests brought together over 140 participants from 50 countries. The workshop began with a summary of progress made in the last ten years (since the first Interlaken CLI in 2004). The remainder of the meeting consisted largely of small group discussions along two axes:

Regional groups: Africa; Asia (including the Middle East); Europe, Central Asia and North America; and Latin America and the Caribbean.

Thematic groups: forest tenure and decentralization; forest landscape governance and the green economy; forest governance and biodiversity; and forest governance and safeguards in REDD+ implementation.

A number of participant-sponsored topics were discussed in a World Café format; and an additional session focused on monitoring and assessment and ways forward. The Major Group of Children and Youth convened a parallel meeting the results of which are also summarized here.

Through a consultative process, a set of recommendations were put forth on topics ranging from the architecture of UNFF, IAF, CPF and their future incarnations, to a broad call for greater forest stewardship, to the identification of topics of particular significance for countries to address themselves. Some crucial recurrent themes included the importance of secure land and forest tenure, more equitable participation of marginalized groups and various other stakeholders, acknowledging and incorporating the rights of indigenous peoples and communities, improvements in coordination and learning both horizontally and vertically within countries and between, addressing corruption and illegal activities of various kinds more effectively, and a stronger role in supporting international processes like REDD+ and green economies.

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	4
II.	Concepts and terminology	5
III.	Background on the five workshops held from 2004 to 2012	6
IV.	Lessons learned in the last ten years	7
V.	Key issues and findings discussed in the workshops for thematic groups	10
VI.	Summary of key issues raised by workshop participants *in toto*	12
VII.	Recommendations directed to UNFF with regard to UNFF11 and to the post 2015 IAF	13
VIII.	Region-specific recommendations directed to UNFF with regard to UNFF11 and to the post 2015 IAF	16
IX.	Detailed issues/rationale for regional recommendations	19
X.	UNFF Interlaken+10: Youth policy brief	21

"Trees don't grow only on soil; they grow on

appropriate policies and institutions" (Bharat Pokharel, workshop participant).

I. Introduction

1. The 11th session of the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF11, 4-15 May 2015, New York) will review the effectiveness of the current "international arrangement on forests" (IAF) and on that basis decide how to strengthen the IAF beyond 2015. As a country led contribution to the discussions at UNFF11, the Governments of Switzerland, Indonesia, South Africa, Mexico and Ukraine co-hosted Interlaken+10: "Workshop on Governing Forest Landscapes: Lessons learned from 10 years of experience and the way forward post-2015" (3-6 February, Interlaken, http://unff-interlaken10.org).[1]

2. Objectives: Interlaken+10 is the sixth workshop in the following series of international workshops on the important topics of forest governance and decentralization: Since 2004, a total of five such workshops were organized biannually, most of them as Country-Led Initiatives in support of the UNFF.

- Decentralization, Federal Systems of Forestry and National Forest Programmes (27-30 April 2004, Interlaken, Switzerland)
- Forest Governance and Decentralization in Asia and the Pacific (4-6 September 2006, Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Forest Governance and Decentralization in Africa (8-11 April 2008, Durban, South Africa)
- Forest Governance, Decentralization and REDD-plus in Latin America and the Caribbean (31 August-3 September 2010, Oaxaca, Mexico)
- Forests in a Green Economy for Countries in Eastern Europe, Northern and Central Asia: Lviv Forum (11-14 September 2012, Lviv, Ukraine)

3. These workshops have clearly demonstrated that good governance is of fundamental importance to achieving sustainable forest management and the contribution of forests and the forest sector to sustainable development. The objectives of Interlaken+10 were to:

- Take stock of the experience gained through previous workshops and lessons learned on governance and decentralisation as they relate to forest management and conservation;

[1] Interlaken+10 was convened by Indonesia, South Africa, Mexico, Ukraine and Switzerland, and co-organized by the Swiss Federal Office for Environment (FOEN); Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC); Bern University of Applied Sciences, School of Agriculture, Forest and Food Sciences (HAFL); HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); and the Programme for Forests (PROFOR). Co-sponsors included the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation & Development, the Norwegian Ministry for Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland, the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs, FOEN and SDC.

- Reflect on developments over the past 10 years related to governance of forest landscapes,[2] taking into account recent developments and trends globally;
- Identify key issues that need to be addressed in a global forest context; and
- Develop concrete proposals and recommendations to UNFF11 on how to meaningfully address governance issues and foster good governance of forest landscapes as part of the post-2015 IAF and UN development agenda.

4. As with the previous workshops, Interlaken+10 was a technical workshop designed to carry the issue of forest governance forward. Participants were invited to speak in their own personal capacities.

5. Participation and format: Interlaken+10 brought together 140 participants from 50 countries, as well as representatives of numerous international, regional and non-governmental organizations. The discussions were organized along two major axes: Regional and topical. Regionally, discussants were grouped into the following regions: Africa; Asia (including the Middle East); Europe, Central Asia and North America; and Latin America and the Caribbean. There was also a global group. From the topical standpoint, discussions were organized around the following four topics:

1. Forest tenure and decentralization
2. Forest landscape governance and the green economy
3. Forest governance and biodiversity
4. Forest governance and safeguards in REDD+ implementation

6. Parallel Conference on Youth: A parallel meeting (3-6 February) was organized by the International Forestry Students Association (IFSA) on behalf of the UNFF Major Group on "Youth and Children". This meeting, which developed a vision for the future of IAF and engagement of youth in the areas of international governance, multiple use of forests, education, technology and SFM, climate and forests, gathered 23 young forestry students from five continents. The objective of the workshop was to offer the space for them to develop concrete policy proposals on the future United Nations forest policy regime, including issues of youth participation and forestry education, in order to frame an input for UNFF11. The group fully embraced the opportunity and, after bringing together and discussing the issues from their different perspectives, informally presented their ideas and recommendations to a group of experts from the Interlaken+10 workshop for a lively exchange on their draft proposals. In addition, they presented their results to the main Interlaken+10 audience on the last day of the workshop.[3]

II. Concepts and terminology

7. The following expressions or "definitions" of governance are in common use. While they differ in precise wording, they all embrace the fundamental elements or

[2] Some prefer the use of forests to the term, 'landscapes'.

[3] Their workshop was funded by the German and Swiss Governments and supported by the main organizers of the conference and the Bern University of Applied Sciences. More detail is provided in Section X.

principles of participatory decision-making, transparency, accountability and the rule of law.

- Governance. Governance is the process of governing, the way in which society is managed and how the competing priorities and interests of different groups are reconciled. It includes the formal institutions of government but also informal arrangements. Governance is concerned with the processes by which citizens participate in decision-making, how government is accountable to its citizens and how society obliges its members to observe its rules and laws (FAO 2009).

- Good Governance. Good governance is participatory, consensus-oriented, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and follows the rule of law. It assures that corruption is minimized, the views of minorities are taken into account, and the voices of the most vulnerable are heard (UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP); http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf).

- Good forest governance is normative and is about quality. Important principles that constitute good governance include: stakeholder engagement or participation, fairness, accountability, transparency, efficiency and effectiveness (from Bodegom et al. 2012, An approach for integrating forest governance into national forest-related monitoring systems, *FAO Forestry Policy and Institutions Working Paper* No. 29, Rome).

- Definitions of governance have been developed for broader natural resource and land use issues. Wider 'landscape governance' approaches can equally apply to forests and to efforts to more explicitly involve and include forest interests in cross-sectoral and landscape-wide governance that can better interface with livelihoods.[4] A CIFOR study found no clear definitions of landscape governance, but Holmgren, CIFOR's Director General, concluded that "It is the human dimension that makes it a landscape. That is, there has to be some form of institution(s) to express ambitions for the geographic area, set priorities and help transform these ambitions into action. We can call this landscape governance and should acknowledge that such governance arrangements can be wildly different and exist as entirely informal as well as strictly formal arrangements" (http://blog.cifor.org/19791/on-landscapes-part-2-what-are-landscapes).

III. Background on the five workshops held from 2004 to 2012

8. The 2004 Interlaken CLI workshop was global in scope and focused on conceptual and operational aspects of decentralization. In 2006, in Yogyakarta, the workshop focused on requisites for economically and technically viable decentralization and governance reform in Asia and the Pacific. The 2008 Durban CLI workshop emphasized governance and decentralization links with livelihoods, conservation and financial flows in Africa. Oaxaca's 2010 workshop addressed governance, decentralization and REDD in Latin American countries. In 2012 the Lviv workshop focused on the role of governance in a pathway towards a green economy in Eastern Europe and Northern and Central Asia.

[4] In this report, the emphasis on landscapes in no way reduces the importance of forests.

9. All five workshops:

- Brought together a range of stakeholders from Government, civil society, research institutions, community organizations and the business sector.
- Examined livelihoods, equity, forest conditions and sustainable development more generally in the context of addressing decentralization.
- Employed a variety of communication approaches, including formal presentations, panel discussions, working groups and field trips.
- Facilitated the sharing of experience among countries, stimulated insights, identified lessons learned and developed recommendations for action by UNFF and others.

10. The reports of all the workshops were presented and distributed at the subsequent UNFF session.

IV. Lessons learned in the last ten years

11. An over-arching finding, encompassing the specifics outlined below, has been the ubiquity of problems relating to bridging scales, knowledge and values in multi-level governance:

a. National and global trends influence social, political, economic interactions at local levels; similarly, and less well recognized, local realities influence how such national and global forces play out.

b. There is increasing fragmentation in dealing with forests at all level and scales, including protective, productive and social functions; there are also differentiated views of SFM.

c. The values and benefits of forests accrue at different scales:

(1) Decentralization should in theory facilitate responsiveness to local values, but power imbalances regularly interfere.

(2) National/global values include, e.g. biodiversity, climate and hydrological regulation, soil protection.

(3) Decentralization should strive for balance and sustainability of values and benefits across scales.

d. Main drivers of deforestation are found at multiple scales and are generally outside the forestry sector; effective cross-sectoral policies are required to address them.

12. Local level communities and local stakeholders

- For forest management to be sustainable at the local level (which is crucial for broader scale sustainability), it must deliver significant, net positive benefits to local communities, households, and individuals, not just burdens (forestry regulations, REDD+, forest conservation).
- Community-based forest management has been shown to be a viable livelihood strategy and a means to address SFM and climate change, but it requires empowerment of local people, capacity-building at various levels, community

support (including recognizing indigenous knowledge, valuing local capabilities, secure tenure).

- Forest law, as reflected locally, consists of inconsistent/conflicting rules, unrealistic prohibitions, burdensome (sometimes corrupt) bureaucratic requirements, and high transaction costs, all of which inhibit local compliance with the law.
- Complaint/conflict resolution mechanisms are needed to guarantee community forest management rights are respected in the design/implementation of REDD+, protected area management and land-use decisions.

13. Landscape level and cross-sectoral coordination

- Landscape transformation has been driven by national/global policies and markets, changing consumption at all levels and expansion of transnational traders and investors.
- Different landscape actors and production systems, with varying dynamic social contexts, result in different land uses, which in turn require appropriately calibrated interventions, incentives and sanctions.
- Landscape approaches add complexity. Engagement of women and the vulnerable becomes more difficult than at the community level. Landscape features that do not coincide with administrative boundaries increase conflict and confusion. Cultural similarities across landscapes, however, may be sources of insights, cooperation.
- There is a need for a holistic and comprehensive approach to governance reforms. This can bring more coherence/consistency to policies in many spheres that affect forests and the people living in and around them.
- Cross-sectoral integration of policies should avoid adversely affecting communities (e.g. through a proliferation of regulations) and should ideally contribute to human health and development.

14. National level: Central government roles and constraints

- Inconsistencies in policies/laws/regulations create/worsen grey areas where corruption and illegality can flourish. Effective collective action can improve regulation and enforcement.
- Central governments tend simply to devolve responsibility with little or no authority or finance.
- Dysfunction of public institutions can be a stumbling block to governance reform. Institutional innovations such as third-party certification, independent observers and Monitoring Reporting and Verification (MRV) approaches for REDD+ can promote change, as can bottom up pressure from an informed, empowered and proactive population.
- The national level also can and should play an important role in providing guidelines, interacting with international actors, and promoting information flow, financing and monitoring.

- A degree of command and control measures can protect and help sustainably manage forests; these are best based on science and robust analysis (including analysis of local human and natural conditions), with transparency and accountability.
- Governments can play a more active, concerted role in stimulating markets for sustainable products (such as certified wood products, wood energy, NTFPs) and services (including carbon offsets).

15. Regional and trans-national levels and cooperation

- Enhancing trans-boundary cooperation in forest protection, forest law enforcement, data analysis and research, and sharing resources for regional capacity building are key.
- There is a need for regional learning platforms and channels for continuing exchanges on forest-related issues among regional stakeholders — governments, scientists, indigenous and local peoples and their organizations, business and health sectors and others — to support regional cooperation, strategy development and concerted action.

16. Global level: governance of the world's forests

- There is a lack of a comprehensive stewardship for forests.[5] There has been some progress towards common discourse and conceptual reference frames but the global forest governance regime remains fragmented.
- There is a serious challenge in translating stated national commitments into concrete actions.
- There is a need to increase the efficiency, effectiveness and capacity of global platforms dealing with forest-related issues to deliver equitable outcomes.
- There is a need to connect global platforms more effectively with regional platforms.
- There is a need to acknowledge the power and potential of lower level actors, as their wishes/responses interact with higher level policies. This can lead to flexibility, feedback and learning in policy/implementation processes at all levels.
- However, some doubts remain that such outcomes can be delivered from the global level considering the experience of the past 20 years.

[5] Stewardship of forests, as used in this report, means providing leadership to promote the vital significance of forests for economic and social development and environmental protection of all countries, to integrate forests and the broader sustainable development agenda and to promote implementation of sustainable management of all types of forest and trees outside forests at all levels through *inter alia* providing relevant policy recommendations and advice, fostering coordination and collaboration with relevant stakeholders, mobilizing resources and high level political support, effective influencing of major international/intergovernmental processes and providing substantive support for activities carried out to this end.

V. Key issues and findings discussed in the workshop's four thematic groups[6]

17. Forest tenure and decentralization

This group emphasized the following:

- There is a need to recognize the efficacy of local communities and indigenous peoples to manage their forest resources sustainably when their forest rights are clearly recognized. The growing body of empirical evidence was discussed, demonstrating that where communities exercise strong, devolved forest tenure rights environmental and social outcomes are better.
- In light of the growing trend for communities to take responsibility for managing forests, changes are needed in the roles of forestry agencies. Most agreed that these agencies should shift from their longstanding role of direct regulation and enforcement to protecting local rights and providing technical advice, in a more advisory and facilitative manner.
- Complexity and high transaction costs can constrain effective forest management by communities.
- There is a need to build on lessons learned from 10 years of work on governance and tenure when considering a possible amendment to the Non Legally Binding Instrument on all Types of Forests, especially in light of the evolving Sustainable Development Goals. Governance and tenure security could usefully be included in Global Objective 2.[7]
- Adopt and encourage countries to implement the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security adopted by the FAO Committee on World Food Security in 2012.
- Build consensus on the necessary elements of a governance system/good governance, building on existing tools such as the PROFOR/FAO Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance (Rome 2011) and World Resources Institute (WRI) forest governance assessment framework.[8]

18. Forest governance and biodiversity

The principles of governance of forest landscapes apply equally to the governance of biodiversity conservation.

Challenges include the following:

- Governance reform processes take time and are vulnerable to shifts in political priorities.
- There is fragmentation of forest issues and insufficient participation of many major stakeholders (notably civil society and the private sector).

---

[6] The recommendations from the regional groups are provided in section VIII; with the full issues/rationales for the recommendations presented in detail in Section IX.

[7] Some participants urged the recommendation of a fifth Global Objective on Governance, a suggestion that met with considerable controversy.

[8] http://www.wri.org/publication/assessing-forest-governance.

19. Forest landscape governance and green economy

This group emphasized the need for long-term investments to incorporate stakeholder interests, in support of more equitable processes, and the difficulty (but necessity) of improving evidence-based indicators for monitoring and evaluation.

Challenges:

- There is inadequate understanding of the compatibility of SFM with a green economy, taking into account the application of green economy principles at the operational level.
- A consensus has not yet been reached on the valuation and payment for ecosystem services within a green economy framework, taking into account the diverse values of landscapes/ecosystem services/cultural and spiritual values.
- Forest sector priorities have not taken into account policies in other sectors and are therefore not fully integrated into the overall policy framework (i.e., there is a need for removal of perverse incentives and subsidies).
- The private sector has not been adequately integrated into forest policy development and implementation at international and national levels.
- Corporate social responsibility in forest industries has not yet progressed sufficiently to ensure SFM.

20. Forest governance and safeguards in REDD+ implementation

An overview of REDD+ from the UN-REDD perspective, an example of a REDD+ project in the Philippines, and an analysis of the benefit sharing mechanisms in several countries, all with special emphasis on how UNFF can contribute to the REDD+ safeguards work, emphasized the complexity of the issue (e.g., seven UNFCCC safeguards, 152 indicators in the Philippine case).

Challenges:

- How best to encourage the adoption and operationalization of the safeguards
- Inadequate sharing of lessons learned with regard to REDD+
- Leveraging and scaling up of forest governance
- Coordination between UN-REDD and other initiatives, and clarification of safeguards and approaches to them, both within and between countries
- Effective mechanisms/platforms for multiple stakeholder involvement, including indigenous peoples
- Elite capture and lack of transparency — significant issues in the various benefit sharing mechanisms being tried

VI. Summary of key issues/points raised by workshop participants *in toto*

21. UNFF and Global Objectives on Forests (GOFs)

- The implementation of SFM and achievement of the four GOFs is critically dependent on good governance at all levels.
- The current four GOFs are not well formulated and contain overlapping elements that are difficult for countries to assess and report on.
- There are also significant gaps in the four GOFs in the areas of governance, scientific/technical cooperation, and forest product production and value-added processing, which form the basis for many of the national and international actions contained in the Forest Instrument and are notable themes reflected in the SDG targets.
- UNFF has weak links to other international forestry processes.

22. Governance and its evidence base

- There is no single form or model of government associated with good governance. The principles of good governance can be applied in systems of government that range from highly centralized to highly decentralized.
- The term "governance" is often used interchangeably to refer to the international institutional architecture, as well as to the way a country takes decisions and applies the rule of law. These are different concepts.
- Putting in place measures for good governance can be difficult and is not without costs; the challenges of good governance often go well beyond the forest sector.
- The role of science in forest governance is only effective if the science is independent.
- Mechanisms to connect discussions and resolutions to action/follow up on the ground are needed.
- Indicators designed to measure forest-related governance already exist. These need to be applied and results reported at global, regional and national levels.

23. Economic, financial and livelihood concerns

- Good governance and a stable national investment climate go hand in hand; good governance is needed to generate private commercial investment, both domestic and international, in SFM.
- There is a difficulty with financing of forest-related initiatives, particularly at the local level.
- Work is needed on the whole value chain for forest products, including production, value-added processing and chain of custody.[9]

[9] See for instance, the Forest Legality Alliance Risk Tool: http://www.forestlegality.org/risk-tool.

- Forest benefits are not equitably distributed, particularly with regard to women and forest peoples.

24. Tenure

- Secure land tenure for communities and indigenous people has multiple benefits, including reducing deforestation and forest degradation, improving forest management and enhancing livelihoods and global justice.

25. Capacity building

- Capacity is inadequate at various levels, particularly as regards the ability of forestry actors to communicate strategically with other sectors and other actors.
- Many countries lack the capacity and expertise to deal with other sectors (e.g. agriculture, transport, energy) that are the drivers of deforestation, and to address disparities in power among stakeholders.
- The development of effective, equitable governance takes time (cf. advances in the Model Forests Network after 20 years of work or the experience of the Adaptive Collaborative Management Program at CIFOR).[10]

26. Communication and decision-making

- More effective and regular communication and sharing of experience could lead to useful learning across sectors and among stakeholders.
- Many forest-related governance issues deal with a country's fundamental decision-making processes regarding land tenure and access to forest resources, civil society participation and transparency.
- Effective mechanisms for cross-sectoral coordination are basic elements of good governance at all levels.

VII. Recommendations directed to UNFF with regard to UNFF11 and to the post 2015 IAF

27. Participants of the CLI consider the following recommendations, recognizing that a variety of opinions have been expressed. We have opted for greater inclusivity, striving to maximize the insights available to UNFF in its coming deliberations.

1. Frame and implement inter-sessional activities at UNFF11 and beyond, within the overall goal of contributing to a broader stewardship of the world's forests.
2. Building on current work by CPF members and others, encourage the CPF or its successor to strengthen support for and facilitate efforts by countries (including building their capacity) to improve forest-related governance and make available financial resources as necessary. This may include, for example, strengthening land tenure security,

[10] See for instance, http://www.imfn.net/ or www.cifor.org/acm/.

mechanisms for effective cross-sectoral and stakeholder coordination, strengthening the capacity of forest rights holders, and enabling environments for investment in SFM at local and national levels.

3. Develop a specific mandate (with financial resources) for CPF or its successor to strengthen and facilitate efforts by countries in the valuation of forest resources and services at local and national levels, improving benefit sharing mechanisms, implementation of PES schemes, and ensuring that forests are fully represented in current efforts to establish national green accounting, using internationally agreed standards, as well as through market mechanisms.

4. Consider amending/updating the Forest Instrument where appropriate to take into account developments on forest governance since 2007, to explicitly address issues related to forest governance, including aspects of good governance such as tenure security, secure rights and a stronger voice for indigenous people and local communities, justice and rule of law, etc.

5. Encourage member states to explicitly include the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in appropriate fora addressing land tenure security (e.g. SDG 1 and 5) and through mechanisms such as the SDG indicators.

6. Strengthen the UNFF, including at UNFF11 and complemented by country level efforts, to play a key role in the coordination, monitoring and review of the forest related aspects of the SDGs.

7. Initiate a process that informs REDD+ and other international processes/ opportunities on broader forest governance issues relevant to SFM and REDD+, takes advantage of lessons learned, and helps operationalize the REDD+ safeguards, including monitoring of its implementation. This process should be complementary to that of UNFCCC, within the pertinent framework and in collaboration with relevant stakeholders.

8. Ensure that future sessions of UNFF and its intersessional processes (including, *inter alia*, CPF or its successor) provide a platform to share experiences and lessons learned related to forest governance among countries and across regions and processes, and provide channels for these lessons to inform Forum decisions.

9. Invite and meaningfully engage in the processes of the Forum and in the implementation of its resolutions all relevant stakeholders who have been inadequately involved,[11] including through the creation of interactive platforms (at regional, national and local levels) that build on existing platforms like national forest programmes (NFPs) or others created through REDD+ or FLEGT, and a serious role in identifying new and emerging issues.

10. In pursuit of stronger political continuity of governance reform processes, combine stronger stakeholder involvement at local and

[11] These include, among others, civil society, the private sector, women, the poor, youth, local communities and indigenous peoples, other Major Groups and regional/subregional bodies.

national levels with the linking of national processes with regional policy frameworks and international commitments.

11. Streamline UNFF resolutions to focus on clarity (adding value without weakening past resolutions), as well as prioritizing actionable items without repeating agreed-upon language and actions, with a view to further enhancing the relevance of the UNFF.

12. Bearing in mind the differing situations and capacities of countries, UNFF-11 should urge member states to commit to strengthening support for and facilitating forest-related governance, including elements such as:

a. Enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and equity of decentralization where appropriate.

b. Strengthen policies, regulations and mechanisms to enhance incentives for investment in SFM at all levels.

c. Improve transparency and access to information (e.g. on concession operations, forest inventories) and address corruption and illegal forest activities.

d. Utilize national forest programs and similar frameworks to engage industry and civil society stakeholders at all levels.

e. Improve strategic communication and coordination among forest stakeholders, between the forest sector and other sectors, and across levels of governance.

f. Strengthen the equitable distribution of benefits across forest-related value chains, including through improved geospatial information on concessions, other land uses and maps, as well as through the creation of enabling conditions, such as technology transfer, R&D support, extension, and policies that support small and medium enterprises.

g. Respect and enforce the rights of the range of forest dependent populations, especially women, the poor, youth, and other marginalized groups.

h. Reinforce, build on and integrate local institutions, knowledge and capabilities in forests and forest management.

i. Raise awareness of the current and potential contributions of local communities and indigenous peoples to SFM.

j. Contextualize forests in broader landscapes, including cultural landscapes, recognizing the safety net functions of forests (for example, subsistence, adaptation, disaster risk reduction).

k. Work with communities to develop systematic and adequate funding and capacity to implement these recommendations.

13. Strengthen processes within the international arrangements on forests to facilitate access of countries to existing financing instruments. These include those in the framework of REDD+ (such as GEF/SFM, REDD+/SFM in the Green Climate Fund) and other forest-related initiatives conducted by CPF members, particularly for initiatives, such

as those listed in Recommendation 12, at the local level. Such processes should also create a supportive governance architecture in the IAF itself to catalyse funding and facilitate access to it.

14. Encourage countries to include monitoring and assessing forest related governance in existing reporting frameworks (including use of existing methods), in pursuit of global forest stewardship.

15. Recognizing the importance of restoration as a major objective of UNFF/IAF, the commitments included in a variety of international agreements, and the significance of governance in reaching these goals, promote forest restoration efforts at various levels, consistent with Global Objective 1, with particular attention to land tenure and the participation of local communities.

16. Reflect on the inclusion of a fifth global objective on forests, in the future post-2015 International Arrangement on Forests, on the role of forest governance for achieving SFM.

VIII. Region-specific recommendations directed to UNFF with regard to UNFF11 and to the post 2015 IAF

The region-specific recommendations are highlighted here, with the challenges and issues that have led to them provided in Section IX.

28. Recommendations from Africa

- Undertake forest policy and legislative reforms in relevant countries.
- Undertake capacity building and skills development for various actors at all levels, and especially for local forest communities.
- Identify ways for financing local community activities (e.g., establishment of Community Resource Management Funds).
- Define clear communication channels for easy information flow where these do not exist.
- Recognize and involve women and youth as important stakeholders.
- Recognize the increasingly important roles of NGOs in forestry work and establish mechanisms for their involvement and accountability.
- Develop clear frameworks for resource ownership (tenure regimes) to promote commitment of various actors in SFM.
- Promote forest restoration efforts at various levels.

29. Recommendations from Asia

- Support capacity building in response to the need for a reorientation of global objectives of forests (SFM, education, access to finance and insurance, etc.).
- Support/develop platforms for learning and communication, including (a) sharing learning on the implementation and monitoring of the Forest

Instrument, (b) catalysing national systems for effective and user friendly communication strategies and (c) promoting sharing forums at regional levels.

- Support assessments in the following spheres:
  - o Valuation of forests to show their contribution to GDP and other goods and services
  - o Identification of stakeholder capacity gaps
  - o Needs assessment of major groups in effective engagement of SFM at all levels
  - o Identification of bottlenecks and monitoring mechanisms to combat corruption in the forest sector
  - o Need for national forest programmes
- Facilitate, support and implement the agreed provisions on
  - o secure tenure rights
  - o fair access to markets
  - o effective association of rights holders
  - o basic support services
  - o facilitation of the mainstreaming, integrating and coordination of related policies, and a process of formulating national and local policies and programmes
  - o identify and recognize the multiple goods and services of the forests
- Develop a monitoring and reporting system for the Forest Instrument and guidelines for its assessment
- Recognize the varying needs and capacity of low forest cover countries and small island developing states.

30. Recommendations from Europe, Central Asia and North America

- Decentralization, where needed, must be systematic with adequate funding and capacity, addressing the problems being experienced, with full participation of relevant stakeholders.
- UNFF should actively build bridges to engage with other sectors (i.e., water, agriculture, energy, biodiversity, construction, tourism, etc.).
- UNFF should encourage member States to establish multi-stakeholder platforms at different levels, and involve them in inter-sessional activities.
- UNFF should initiate an analysis of social, economic and environmental costs and benefits of good forest governance.
- The forest sector should contribute to the work being carried out under the system of environmental-economic accounting under the UN to reflect better the value of forests in national accounts.
- Countries should support mechanisms (e.g., private owner associations) to increase the efficiency of small scale forestry.

- Explore ways to strengthen the active and positive engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities in forest management.
- Carry out further work to establish incentive mechanisms (such as payments for environmental services, PES) that allow forest owners to capture the benefits for providing ecosystem services.

31. Recommendations from Latin America and the Caribbean

- Encourage better coordination and communication across scales, in response to additional financial resources and opportunities for capacity building.
- Encourage and support stronger institutions at the sub-national level with adequate capacity to implement actions on the ground and to fulfil their mandates.
- Support better coordination between agencies that focus on development, participation, and environmental issues.
- Design and provide better tools and mechanisms that allow translation of policy visions into operations on the ground with adequate financing.
- Support use of existing tools/mechanisms more efficiently and in an integrated manner.
- Generate and provide governments with clear guidelines for environmental governance at sub-national level (e.g., mainstreaming land use planning at different scales).
- Encourage holistic approaches that address forests in support of effective environmental governance.
- Support efforts to move decentralized government agencies beyond monitoring and control, and transform them into strategic partners for forest management.
- Strengthen governmental recognition that decentralization is actually a long-term effort that includes and needs institution building.
- Seek out and build on existing development and social mechanisms that can channel resources and capacities from national to local and vulnerable populations (e.g., social development mechanisms, national conservation programmes).
- Encourage governments to design and implement monitoring, in cooperation with decision-makers, to organize environmental information in an effective manner (nationally and sub-nationally).
- Encourage holistic, multi-scale land use planning and joint prioritization of areas with multiple land management goals.
- Encourage improvements in participation of the forest sector in national accounting systems while assessing different methods and means to do so.
- Encourage countries to improve tracking/traceability systems for forest products.
- Recognize the relevance of forest-related services to risk reduction efforts and as safety nets for vulnerable populations.

- Encourage engaging market actors, recognizing the diversity of objectives of enterprises, with a clearer set of goals and mechanisms.
- Assess the role of the Latin American and the Caribbean Forestry Commission (COFLAC; FAO) and its possibilities within the new IAF to start refining a roadmap based on knowledge sharing and exchange of lessons learnt.
- Evaluate the feasibility/need for proposing a technical regional body to assess countries in forestry related issues and design governance structures.

IX. Detailed issues/rationales for regional recommendations

While most regions acknowledged some progress in decentralization and governance related to forests, the following issues and challenges remain, and led to the region-specific recommendations listed above:

32. Africa issues and challenges

- Limited or no financial resources at the local level to support SFM
- Inadequate capacities of various stakeholders, especially the local communities
- In some cases, still unclear communication channels for information flow
- Weak forest policy and legislative frameworks in some countries
- Marginalization of women and youth in forest management planning and decision making
- Reluctance of governments/the state to devolve sufficient authority to local communities to own and manage forest resources
- Inadequate transparency in the sharing of forest benefits and resulting conflicts among various stakeholders and lack of trust for state forest managers
- Whereas NGOs play increasingly important roles in SFM, they lack coordination within the forest sector, which could increase accountability.

33. Asia issues and challenges:

- Weak interagency coordination at country level
- Weak voice and economic incentives for the poor
- Limited area and quality of forest resources available for community forestry
- Contribution of forests to GDP and valuation of its various functions
- Policy and legal frameworks either non-existent or not implemented
- Lack of clarity of tenure rights of local communities and indigenous people
- Uncertainty about how to "sustain the gains"
- Conflicting objectives on the use of forests, e.g., conservation versus use
- Limited capacity of rights holders and stakeholders
- Lack of clarity in the roles, responsibilities and rights of duty bearers and rights holders
- Lack of true decentralization and devolution

34. Europe, Central Asia and North America regions' issues and challenges

Unlike the other regions, some participants in this group did not automatically consider decentralization itself to be a necessarily desirable goal. This group noted improvements in representation, coordination and use of funds in situations both with decentralization and without.

Challenges:

- Meaningful involvement of indigenous peoples
- Broad economic interests not always shared by all stakeholders
- Local authorities'/communities' need for the capacity and willingness to report/be accountable
- Shift and increased workload to local authorities on forest management without adequate funding from the national or local levels
- Adequate balance of shared responsibilities between the central and local levels; as well as among forest related sectors
- Conflicting interests of different stakeholders in forestry

35. Latin American and Caribbean issues and challenges

Although a number of positive changes were identified in these countries, the focus here is on the remaining issues and challenges:

- Fragmentation of governance among scales and between technical personnel and decision makers
- A tendency to consider that 'one size fits all' in thinking about tools and strategies to implement decentralized forest governance
- Limited recognition of human diversity and diverse livelihood strategies, as well as inadequate access of local communities to decision-making processes
- Inequitable benefit sharing with/among local communities
- Lack of coordinated policy-making and mainstreaming of good forest governance
- Poorly designed instruments to translate policy into action
- Decentralization still seen as a goal attainable in the "short term"
- Inadequate generation and storage or management of information
- Persistent dichotomy between decision-makers and technicians/practitioners within public entities
- Lack of recognition of the full value of forest benefits
- Limited progress in realizing the potential benefits of public-private partnerships to fund and support SFM
- Lack of attention to forests and SFM in the agendas of regional governance bodies (e.g. the Caribbean Community Secretariat, CARICOM, The Union of South American Nations, UNASUR, Climate Action Network International, CAN).

X. UNFF Interlaken +10: Youth policy brief

The UNFF Major Group Children and Youth (MGCY) held a policy analysis youth workshop in parallel to the CLI reported here. The workshop consisted of a step-by-step process, grounded in policy analysis and implementation theory, whereby youth representatives from 16 different countries identified relevant issues for youth in relation to forest management and governance. The following section is divided in five main thematic areas; each presenting said issues and the recommended policy solutions that emerged from the workshop. These policy proposals can be taken as stand-alone solutions to specific problems identified, or can be integrated in a holistic manner.

36. Forest Policy and Governance

Current forest governance practices result in overlapping jurisdiction at the international level, and other policy issues consistently overshadow those of forest governance. There has been inadequate implementation of previously agreed policies by UNFF members, and UNFF efforts have been limited to addressing problems of the past, with inadequate participation by non-governmental stakeholders.

To address these problems, the MGCY proposes a revision to ECOSOC's rules governing Major Group participation in deliberations and decision-making processes; if the UNFF wants to stay relevant, it must adapt these rules to the 21st century, and enable civil society participation in all stages of discussion. A complementary strategy to this proposal is the establishment of a permanent working group tasked with staying current on emerging forest policy and governance challenges, opportunities, and priorities, for their timely inclusion in UNFF's agenda. The working group should be comprised of representatives from Major Groups and CPF, be representative of diverse geographical regions, and meet at least once a year. In addition to the working group, the UNFF should shorten the term of its program of work in order to better integrate emerging issues.

37. Multiple Uses of Forests

Current economic policies emphasize profit-logic perspectives of consumption of goods and services that go beyond planetary boundaries. Furthermore, there exists a misrepresentation of the associated social and ecological costs, and a lack of transparency and accountability of global supply chains that has resulted in waste and inappropriate distribution of resources. This has led to further marginalization of already-oppressed groups.

To address these issues, the UNFF could develop and adopt international action plans to deal with transparency and accountability standards for governments and multi-national corporations (MNC) dealing with forest products. We further recommend the design and implementation of action plans that promote the use of indigenous sciences and practices in forest management. These action plans should be developed and implemented in accordance to international agreements, such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and International Labour Organization Convention No. 169. These international agreements will provide for the consultation, consent, and involvement of the holders of indigenous science to promote fair and equitable sharing from their use of forests.

38. Forestry Education

There is a lack of societal awareness of the multiple values of forests and many education systems have failed to adapt to emerging issues and approaches. In response to the education-related goals stated within the NLBI, we recommend a policy proposal with several components that should be implemented simultaneously.

Primarily, our proposal is to establish a 'Forest Impact Lab' (FIL), tasked with strengthening collaborative research and development of forestry education. The aim of this virtual 'global centre of excellence' is to identify gaps in, and develop innovative tools and technologies to inform and shape, forestry curricula, communications, and capacity building. Two unique projects for the FIL have been identified: 1) the continual development of a global forestry education and communications toolbox; and 2) establishment of an annual Forest Impact Week (co-chaired by youth), consisting of regional workshops and a global symposium, to facilitate up-take of FIL outputs and set priorities for the coming year. Hosted by a re-established global forest education network under the UNFF Secretariat, the FIL would consist of a core group of representatives from the CPF, regional education networks, and the MGCY. The FIL would then function as a participatory and dynamic platform to connect researchers, practitioners and students/youth, as well as existing and emerging regional education networks.

39. Forest Management and Technology

Strongly linked to inadequacies within the realm of forest education is the issue of lack of access to new technologies and reliable data, particularly for youth from developing regions. Even if UNFF promotes the development and application of scientific and technological innovations to advance Sustainable Forest Management (SFM), currently there is limited availability of reliable data and limited utilization of new technologies that hinder these objectives.

Based on the aforementioned problems, we recommend the establishment of an internet/wiki-based learning platform and global data network in support to FAO's SFM toolbox to share knowledge and promote capacity building among youth and other Major Groups. Additionally, transfer of environmentally sound technologies and emphasis on research and technology should be emphasized in the Forest Instrument as a means of achieving SFM.

40. Forest and Climate Change

Two major gaps have been identified: firstly, there are inadequate long-term strategic approaches to address the impacts of climate change on SFM. Secondly, there is a lack of coordination within the UNFF to address climate change in relation to forests from both mitigation and adaptation standpoints.

Climate change is mentioned only once and very vaguely in the current version of the NLBI. Thus, we recommend the inclusion of a clause (ideally in Section VI, but also in section V) to prioritize climate change mitigation and adaptation, and to strengthen the capacity of countries to address these issues through SFM.

United Nations E/CN.18/2015/13

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
31 March 2015

Original: English

United Nations Forum on Forests
Eleventh session
New York, 4-15 May 2015
Item 5 of the provisional agenda*
Enhanced cooperation and policy and programme coordination, including the provision of further guidance to the Collaborative Partnership on Forests

Note verbale dated 30 March 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Nepal to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

The Permanent Mission of Nepal to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General and has the honour to transmit the summary report of the workshop entitled "Sustainable forest management: designing the vehicles for securing the means of implementation", a major group-led initiative in support of the United Nations Forum on Forests, held in Kathmandu from 2 to 6 March 2015 (see annex).**

The Permanent Mission would appreciate it if the present note and the report were issued as a document of the United Nations Forum on Forests.

* E/CN.18/2015/1.
** The annex is being circulated in the language of submission only.

15-05206 (E) 090415

Please recycle

Annex to the note verbale dated 30 March 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Nepal to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Sustainable forest management: Designing the vehicles for securing the means of implementation

Summary report of the Major Groups-Led Initiative in support of the United Nations Forum on Forests, Kathmandu, Nepal, 2-6 March 2015

Summary

Major Groups play a critical role within the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), both in contributing to policy formulation and in the implementation of UNFF decisions at regional, national and local levels. Engaging Major Groups effectively is therefore key to the success of the work of UNFF, and the achievement of the 4 Global Objectives on Forests (GOF's) stated in the Non-legally Binding Instrument on all Types of Forests (NLBI) adopted by the seventh session of UNFF (UNFF7).

In March 2015, a global workshop of the Major Groups-Led Initiative in support of the UNFF was hosted by the Government of Nepal. The objective was to develop concrete recommendations for the eleventh session of the UNFF11. The workshop was made possible through financial contributions from the Federal Government of Germany, as well as the support of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) and the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF).

In approaching the overall theme of "Sustainable forest management: Designing the vehicles for securing the means of implementation", participants heard presentations on a number of case studies, and focused their discussions on three topics: the new United Nations body for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM); financial mechanisms for undertaking SFM; and enhancing the engagement of Major Groups participation in the UNFF process. Based on the workshop discussions, key recommendations were developed for presentation to UNFF11 in May 2015.

Contents

	Page
Background and context	4
Organizational matters	4
Venue and duration of the workshop	4
Attendance and participation	4
Central objective	5
Opening ceremony	5
Sustainable forest management: Designing the vehicles for securing the means of implementation	7
Overview presentations	7
Presentation of case studies	8
Participant discussions and recommendations	11
Key recommendations (communiqué)	18
Closing ceremony	18
Annex 1: Communiqué on a Major Groups Workshop developing recommendations for UNFF11	20
Annex 2: List of workshop participants	23

Background and context

1. Since the establishment of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), Major Groups have played pivotal roles in the global policy debates while also working directly at the grassroots level in the areas of conservation and sustainable forest management.

2. The engagement of some Major Groups (MGs) at the global policy level has provided a unique opportunity for them to create awareness of policy decisions and their implications, as well as support the drive for implementation among peers at the grassroots level. Building these partnerships and multi-stakeholder collaborations, both from the ground up and from policies down, is vital in the goal to achieve the global objectives and national policy measures as expressed in the Non-Legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests (NLBI).

3. During UNFF8 in 2009, governments passed a resolution that stressed the importance of Major Groups involvement in the UNFF process and called for their active support in enhancing their involvement. In line with this priority, UNFF Major Groups on two occasions jointly organized Global Workshops in support of UNFF to develop policy recommendations for UNFF9 in 2010 and UNFF10 in 2013. These workshops were hosted by the governments of Ghana and Brazil respectively. Major Groups also founded an international body called the Major Groups Partnership on Forests (MGPoF), registered in Ottawa, Canada, to coordinate their activities and to enhance their contribution to UNFF global policy formulation and implementation.

4. The workshop held in Nepal in from 2-6 March 2015 was the third in the series of Global Workshops to contribute to the UNFF process. It was made possible through the generous financial contribution from the Government of Germany with support from the Government of Nepal, ITTO and the UNFF Secretariat.

5. In developing their recommendations to address the theme of UNFF11, Major Groups adopted the following theme for their 2015 workshop, "Sustainable forest management: Designing the vehicles for securing the means of implementation." Participants heard presentations on a number of case studies, and focused their discussions on three topics: the new United Nations body for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM); financial mechanisms for undertaking SFM; and enhancing the engagement of Major Groups participation in the UNFF process.

6. The working groups' work thus served as the basis for development of Major Group recommendations for UNFF11. It also served as the basis for a communiqué that was issued to participants and to media at the end of the workshop.

Organizational matters

Venue and duration of the workshop

7. The Major Groups-Led Initiative took place at the Park Village Hotel in Kathmandu, Nepal from 2-6 March 2015.

Attendance and participation

8. The workshop was attended by 76 participants from 36 countries representing the following 8 of the 9 official Major Groups identified by the United Nations: Children and Youth; Farmers and Small Forests Landowners; Indigenous Peoples;

Local Authorities; Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs); Scientific and Technological community; Women; and Wood Workers and Trade Unions. Representatives of the ninth UN Major Group on Business and Industry were not present.

Central objective

9. The overarching goal of the workshop was to enhance the implementation of UNFF decisions toward sustainable forest management within the framework of establishing a successor institution with the means for future policy development and implementation. The central objective was to develop concrete recommendations for UNFF11, to be held in New York from 4-15 May 2015.

Opening ceremony

10. The opening ceremony took place on the morning of Monday, 2 March 2015. Guest speakers at the opening ceremony included:

- Mr. Lambert Okrah, President of the Major Groups Partnership on Forests (MGPoF)
- Dr. Manoel Sobral Filho, Director, UNFF Secretariat
- The Hon. Mahesh Acharya, Minister of Forests and Soil Conservation, Government of Nepal

11. As Co-Chairs of the opening ceremony, Mr. Krishna Acharya, UNFF Focal Point for Nepal, and Mr. Ghan Shyam Pandey, UNFF Focal Point for Framers and Small Forest Landowners, made their acceptance remarks by welcoming the participants to Nepal and listed the 8 Major Groups (MGs) in attendance. They encouraged everyone to explore their country of Nepal, and to experience its rich biodiversity, culture, wilderness and beauty. They stressed the importance of the opportunity to strengthen the future of forest management and to develop concrete ideas and recommendations on how to save our forests not just for ourselves, but for future generations.

12. On behalf of the Organizing Committee, Mr. Lambert Okrah welcomed all participants to the workshop. Mr. Okrah expressed sincere appreciation to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal for accepting to host the workshop, and to both Mr. Acharya and Mr. Pandey who played important roles in making the event possible. He also expressed deep gratitude for the financial contributions from the Federal Government of Germany, as well as for the support of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) and the UNFF Secretariat. Mr. Okrah cited the vital importance of the role of MGs in the work of the United Nations, and in the UNFF. He reminded participants that UNFF11 marks the end of the mandate of the current UNFF. As such, this MGI Workshop provides a unique opportunity to build on the gains made to date; to re-shape and create a new robust institution that can deal with the challenges of SFM of our time; and to address the fractured and fragmented discussions as well as the deforestation and forest degradation that has continued during the UNFF's tenure. Mr. Okrah emphasized that the three sub-themes of the workshop will be to consider issues relating to a new institution to replace the old one; to discuss the financial mechanisms and mode for securing technology transfer for SFM; and to establish modalities for enhancing the participation of Major Groups and other stakeholders. He stressed that UNFF11 is

the period to re-build, re-name and re-launch a new UN body on forests that has the capacity to both review policies and facilitate implementation. He closed with a call to participants to bring concrete, creative recommendations to UNFF11 that really define what MGs truly value, and showcase what MGs can contribute to the process.

13. In his official opening address, the Honourable Minister Mahesh Acharya welcomed participants on behalf of the Government of Nepal. He stressed that the forests, which occupy not only 40% of Nepal's land area, but also provide vital goods and services, are a very important resource for his country. Forests are the esteemed natural wealth of human beings, and humans are both the major consumer and saviour of its resources. They are not only the means for survival, but also a major player for the economic prosperity of the millions of poor people who live in the vicinity of forests, and of Nepal as a country. He shared several national initiatives of the Government of Nepal, including successful Community Forest programmes that have been recognized at the global level, and a new Forest Policy endorsed in 2015 for the effective and sustainable management of forests. Mr. Acharya expressed his confidence that the workshop will identify key areas of achievements, convergences and differences with regards to the current international arrangements on forests, and that the participants will develop concrete recommendations for UNFF11.

14. Dr. Manoel Sobral Filho gave the MGI Workshop's keynote address. He expressed appreciation for Nepal as a leading example of the achievements and continuing challenges of community-based forest management and its contributions to improved forest conditions, greater forest cover, increased economic benefits, social mobilization and the institutionalization of democracy at the grassroots level. Dr. Sobral highlighted the critical advocacy role civil society organizations have in influencing the public and legitimizing global forest-related decisions, and that for this reason, the UNFF has a long standing tradition of openness and transparency in its working modalities to provide opportunities for active civil society stakeholders to participate and present their views on all aspects of SFM policy and practices. He stressed the importance of forests, citing that 80% of humanity depends on the survival of forests that provide fiber, fuel, filter water for crops, maintain the soil and help to stabilize global warming. He also reminded participants that the regenerative aspects of forests make them a far better investment than the unsustainable, non-biodegradable products society are addicted to, like plastics.

15. Dr. Sobral then focused on the UN agenda around forests. He underscored that forests, for the first time, are featured highly in the Sustainable Development Goals and the post-2015 UN Development Agenda. He encouraged participants to consider 5 key needs during their deliberations:

- To mainstream forests by recognizing and showcasing how crucial they are, at all levels of development.
- The importance of highlighting the security of forests, including a call to governments to effectively address illegal deforestation.
- To include the private sector in recommendations to mobilize financing for SFM, and to recognize that any funding will have to compete with other urgent issues, like health, particularly in developing countries.
- To create good governance systems to effectively mobilize resources.

- For a coherent institution on forests at the global level, to build on the work of the UNFF whose mandate is coming to an end.

16. He stressed that the issue of a legally or non-legally binding agreement on forests should not be a priority discussion point. What's needed is a strong commitment from and the deep political will of governments not just to discuss and to plan, but to take action, regardless of whether an agreement is legally-binding or not. He also underscored the need for financing, and to increase the competiveness of the forest sector to access existing funds. Without these two essential changes, it will be business as usual. In closing, Dr. Sobral made an enthusiastic call to participants to develop quality materials and specific recommendations that will contribute significantly to UNFF11 discussions and shape SFM in the post-2015 UN Development Agenda.

Sustainable forest management: Designing the vehicles for securing the means of implementation

Overview presentations

17. Two presentations provided an overview of background information and context for participants regarding the UNFF processes to date.

1. Overview of the review process of UN Forum on Forests presentation on the review process, by Ms. Njeri Kariuki, UNFF Secretariat

18. Ms. Kariuki set the stage for all participants by reminding them that UN Member States will be reviewing the effectiveness of the International Agreement on Forests (IAF) at the upcoming UNFF11, and will decide on the future of the IAF arrangement beyond 2015. UNFF11's overall theme of "Forests: progress, challenges and the way forward for the IAF" will include a review of the effectiveness of the IAF, the progress achieved towards the global objectives on forests, and the contribution of forests and the IAF to internationally agreed development goals. It will focus on the past performance of the UNFF and its processes, the non-legally binding instrument on all types of forests (Forest Instrument), the UNFF Secretariat, the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), and the UNFF within the context of the UN Sustainable Development Framework, including the outcome of Rio+20 and the post-2015 UN Development Agenda. Ms. Kariuki explained that, in view of the above, a number of activities have been organized in preparation for UNFF11. These include an independent assessment, intergovernmental ad hoc expert groups 1&2 (AHEG 1&2) on the IAF, Country-Led Initiatives in support of the UNFF in China and Switzerland, and this Major Groups-Led Initiative in support of UNFF. The outcomes, conclusions and recommendations from all of these intersessional activities will be submitted to UNFF11 as inputs for consideration.

2. Food and Agriculture Organization presentation on Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), by Mr. Jeff Campbell, FAO

19. Mr. Campbell provided an overview of the history, objectives and structure of the CPF as well as a comprehensive analysis of its achievements and challenges to date and a vision for the future. He emphasized that the CPF's mission remains valid but, as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will be central to the future International Agreement on Forests (IAF), the CPF will require a stronger focus on

the post-2015 development agenda in its mission and objectives as well as the consistent and strong engagement of individual CPF member organizations. Amended future objectives will include supporting the work of UNFF and its member countries as well as other inter-governmental processes related to forests and the post-2015 development agenda; and enhancing cooperation and coordination on forest issues. Mr. Campbell also underscored the important role of Major Groups and other non-governmental stakeholders in achieving sustainable forest management (SFM) and the need for the CPF to enhance the engagement of Major Groups, particularly in specific activities based on CPF priority actions at the regional and national levels.

Presentation of case studies

20. Five case studies were prepared and presented in order to inform and stimulate discussions. Full case study texts are available for download from the workshop website: www.mgp-forests.org.

1. The institutional framework of an independent UN institution: The case of International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), by Mr. Steve Johnson, ITTO

21. After first clarifying that the ITTO is, in fact, not a UN institution but rather an intergovernmental organization that works with, but outside of, the UN system, Mr. Johnson gave a comprehensive overview of its core priorities, institutional structure, membership, funding, objectives, action plans, achievements and challenges. He stressed that the ITTO's core priority is to promote the conservation, sustainable management, use and trade of tropical timber and non-timber forest products. He also underscored the ITTO's fundamental concept that consumers and producers are equal, and how the organization has structured itself to give equal weight to both groups in terms of voting rights as well as the equal sharing of the results, resources and outcomes.

22. During a lively discussion in plenary after the case study was presented, several cautionary points of interest to Major Groups and the objectives of this workshop were raised, including:

a) the danger of establishing new funds in statutory language without either confirmed donor support or a realistic vision of where the money will come from

b) the importance of full-time, permanent, paid staff at the Secretariat of the new UN body on forests to ensure motivation, consistency and momentum

c) the need to be aware of, and sensitive to, the perceptions of other agencies when setting up new mechanisms and structures, particularly around funding

d) the risks of putting dates on goals, particularly on international objectives that can only be achieved and measured at the national level. Measurable progress over time leads to credibility and trust, whereas missing a single objective by a specific date undermines all such progress.

2. The institutional framework of an ECOSOC institution: The case of UNFF, by Mr. Mafa Evaristus Chipeta, independent policy consultant

23. The case study gave an analysis of the current situation of the International Agreement on Forests (IAF), as UNFF, including its achievements in maintaining momentum on post-Rio forests dialogue and the development of many resolutions and proposed actions, but resulting in little implementation; a Secretariat low in the UN hierarchy with few staff and over half of its budget being voluntary or extra-budgetary; a voluntary Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) that is not coordinated in countries; an inability to mobilize adequate sustained funding for SFM implementation; the constraints of having UNFF under ECOSOC, particularly in diminishing effective convening power and implementation; and the focus of UNFF on foresters with limited links to other sectors and processes.

24. Recommendations for alternative, desirable attributes for a new body on forests include: maintaining the established, successful dialogue processes; adding and prioritizing implementation of proposed actions and resolutions that arise from such dialogue; developing a focused, strategic plan; building partnerships at the regional level; using country-led initiatives (CLIs), organization-led initiatives (OLIs), major group initiatives (MGIs) and regional-led initiatives (RLIs) to promote action; and broadening the focus beyond the forestry sector.

25. Mr. Chipeta provided four possible options for a post-UNFF process: to keep the new body under ECOSOC but with adaptations; to keep it within the UN but move it to an operational agency such as UNDP, FAO or ITTO; to keep the policy forum under ECOSOC but build and move implementation to elsewhere within the UN; or to move outside the UN and tailor-make a new implementation-focused institution. He then gave a list of benefits and challenges for each of the four options.

26. In closing, it was emphasized that, irrespective of the chosen option, to make the IAF effective: governments must prove their political commitment with higher forestry budgets and investment incentives, and accept responsibility for their implementation; institutions for economic, environmental and social roles of forests must be unified and harmonized; country-level initiatives must be coordinated and not focus exclusively on bilateral dealings with external development partners; effective IAF Focal Points need to be designated; and donors in countries must respect the Paris Declaration principles on aid harmony and coordination.

3. Targeting international funding mechanisms towards funding sustainable forest management (SFM), presented by Mr. Prajual Karki, MGPoF

27. The case study explored the need for funding SFM to meet the direct costs of forest management, to fulfill the gap of economic benefit, to prevent non-sustainable activities of forest products, to save our environment, and to build capacity for SFM. The presentation explained the categories of funding available for financing forestry activities. The presentation categorized them as follows: national and public, national and private, international and public, and international and private, key points stressed regarding SFM funding include: the ODA is the core of international public sector finance; bilateral funds depend on donor policies; SFM is a long term minimum return, high capital investment process; and a general lack of knowledge of the effects of deforestation results in SFM investment not being a priority of funders. It is vital to promote private sector participation in SFM, to

compensate for short term costs; to provide subsidies to the capital investment; and that active participation of member-led initiatives be supported.

4. The institutional arrangement between an NGO focal organization and a UN body: The case of Climate Action Network International (CAN) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), by Dr. Christian Holz, independent research consultant

28. The case study outlined eight specific policy recommendations, based on lessons learned from CAN's involvement in the UNFCCC process. These recommendations fell into two categories: relationships between observer organizations and UN bodies; and internal organization of the observer network or partnership. In the first category, recommendations included: to establish and maintain an expectation for, and a record of, clear and transparent decision making by the UN body with regards to observer engagement; to demand and defend a status of observer interventions and submissions that is, as far as possible, identical to those of Parties; and to cultivate relationships with Parties which are genuinely interested in effective stakeholder participation. With regards to internal organization of MG networks, recommendations included: being mindful of imbalances in participation in internal deliberations and plan specific steps to overcome these barriers; select a specific, and explicit, mode for consensus in decision-making on internal and external documents; break large, complex topics into manageable sub-areas; ensure participants in collective decision-making or policy formulation are aware of the anticipated timelines and means in which to contribute to the process; and remain vigilant about both the benefits and potential negative impacts of virtual communications.

5. Strengthening the mechanisms of Major Groups' engagement with UN Bodies towards sustainable forest management, presented by Mr. Lambert Okrah, President, MGPoF

29. Mr. Okrah gave a brief historical account of the institutionalization of Major Groups' (MGs) engagement within the UN since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 and underscored the general understanding that the UN system functions better when the engagement of MGs is enhanced and adequately supported. The presentation made reference to a report (E/CN.17/2013/2) presented at the 20th session of Commission on Sustainable Development on the subject and highlighted the following recommendations from that report: UN to enhance MG participation focused on the establishment of criteria for creating new MGs; enhanced coherence among all UN bodies that deal with MGs; establishing links between the local, regional and global levels; more participation of social movements; the involvement of civil society on expert panels; and the establishment of better administrative support for MGs. Recommendations for MGs included increased structure in MG governance; establishing minimum standards for MG statements; strengthening and supporting the MG on non-governmental organizations; and prioritizing the engagement of people on the front lines. Recommendations for Member States included establishing adequate and predictable funding for MGs; re-establishing multi-stakeholder dialogues; and holding open consultations with public interest.

30. The case study also reviewed the engagement of MGs in UNFF, including both achievements to date and constraints and challenges faced by MGs within the ECOSOC and UNFF structures. The evolution of MG engagement within UNFF

since 2009 was highlighted, from the establishment of the Major Groups Partnership on Forests, to the development of joint papers, to the organization of Major Groups-Led Initiative workshops in support of UNFF, and the successful raising of funds and collaboration from certain governments and international organizations.

Participant discussions and recommendations

31. Participants joined one of three discussion groups. Each group had a facilitator and five guiding questions. All groups worked on each of the three following discussion topics: the new United Nations body for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM); financial mechanisms for undertaking SFM; and enhancing the engagement of Major Groups participation in the UNFF process. All groups were tasked with developing concrete recommendations directed towards the work of the eleventh session of the UNFF. Recommendations were discussed in plenary. Participants then joined one of three working groups, each assigned to focus on one of the three discussion topics. Each working groups was tasked to review, synthesize and refine all of the recommendations made from the previous three discussion groups and to present their consolidated reports to the plenary for final discussion and input.

1. Topic 1: The new United Nations body for sustainable forest management (SFM)

Guiding questions

32. The following five questions were posed to guide discussions:

a) Why do we need an effective UN body on forests?

b) Why is the current one not effective?

c) What are the good elements of the current one?

d) What conclusions can you draw from your understanding of the current IAF on its institutional and operational systems?

e) What suggestions do you have for the structure and operation of the new body to make the new UN body effective?

Narrative summary and highlights

33. Participants highlighted many reasons to have an effective UN body on forests including: a pressing need to raise the profile of forests to the highest level in the global arena and to clearly articulate the importance of forests; to have an effective platform to work with, and ensure that, governments are active, accountable and transparent in their national commitments around SFM; to bring synergy to address the fragmentation and conflicts between different UN Agencies, Parties and bodies involved in forest-related issues; to bring a holistic approach that mobilizes not just governments, but the MGs that disseminate policies on the ground; to facilitate the implementation of over 270 recommendations that have been identified and agreed upon to date through the UNFF process; and to ensure the interests and rights of all Major Groups as well as all people who "live in it, with it and depend on it" are safeguarded.

34. Participants noted the following concerns and limitations of the current UNFF process: due, in large part, of the UNFF being hosted within ECOSOC, it has been solely a dialogue-based process without the capacity to take dialogue to

implementation; the subsequent lack of decision-making power as well as the high level of bureaucracy and hierarchy has resulted in the UNFF being unable to reach a high level profile forum status; a lack of commitment and political will from Member States on SFM, in part due to other perceived priorities such as climate change; minimal success in centralizing discussions and actions on forest issues which are often discussed outside of UNFF on other platforms or at other UN bodies; the absence of specific targets and indicators for the global objective on forests; the limited resources to ensure robust MG participation despite its Agenda 21 commitments; and a bias towards the economic valuation aspects for forests with minimal consideration of the social, ecological and cultural benefits and challenges of forests.

35. Benefits and achievements of the UNFF recognized by participants included: as an intergovernmental platform, all governments are members of UNFF; over 270 recommendations have been developed and agreed upon; it has been a driving point for international forest policy dialogue, and has raised the attention of the international community to forest-related issues through the establishment of both the International Year of Forests (2011) and the International Day of Forests (March 21); through the CPF, it has helped develop tools for SFM including FAO's National Forest Program, IUFRO's Climate Action Plan and specific criteria and indicators developed by the ITTO; and, compared to many other UN bodies, the UNFF is much more open to MG participation, including a staff liaison at the Secretariat who not only is available as a direct contact for MGs, but who is able to link MGs with policy makers.

Conclusions

36. After weighing achievements, constraints and needs, participants made the following conclusions:

a) The UNFF's placement within ECOSOC has led to a rich dialogue that resulted in more than 270 recommendations, but it does not provide scope or capacity for implementation. The present hierarchy and complexity within ECOSOC at the divisional level hinders decision-making as bureaucracy is very high. MGs want to see more focus on implementation of the forest instrument and goals on forests.

b) There is a lack of ownership of UNFF recommendations, as seen in some of the language used that asks Parties to "consider" and "encourage" but does not call on Parties to "commit". With clauses of "national limitations and territorial sovereignty" the Parties are more reluctant to take on recommendations that might be too ambitious.

c) Any new UN Body on forests still needs to be part of the UN system so as to ensure full governmental participation and to retain access to processes that are often exclusive.

Recommendations

37. The following recommendations were made:

a) MGs propose a new multi-stakeholder UN Forest Organization, not under ECOSOC, that addresses both policy and implementation, and that will deal with

forestry issues in a coordinated and holistic manner at the global, regional, national and local levels.

b) The issue of forests is included in several of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs, goals 6, 15 and 17). The new UN body on forests should be responsible for the high political level dialogue on SDGs on forest related issues, including the review of policies and the establishment of dedicated funds to implement its work on the ground. The new body should also be responsible for coordinating all institutions and mechanisms engaged on forest issues within the UN, and to bring synergies between different agencies and stakeholders.

c) The new UN body on forests must meet more regularly than bi-annually, and/or must have specific working groups that both keep momentum going on agreed upon issues, and address key emerging issues.

d) Given that current funding for forests is largely within UN funds tied to the climate sector, the new UN body for forests must have a stronger role in providing input into the use of these funds.

e) While recognizing that such a change may lead to slower agreements from the Parties, MGs propose that forest recommendations need to be legally binding so that there will be a compulsory mechanism to push governments to adopt, and act upon, recommendations already made by the UNFF as well as future recommendations developed by the new UN body on forests.

f) MGs need to be part of the governing structure of the new UN body on forests.

g) The new UN body for forests should serve as the coordinating body of CPF.

2. Topic 2: Financial mechanisms for undertaking sustainable forest management (SFM)

Guiding questions

38. The following five questions were posed to guide discussions:

a) What is the MG perspective on the nature of funding for SFM?

b) What are the existing financial mechanisms for SFM? And what can be done to attract the needed funds for SFM?

c) How can the understanding of the value of the goods and services from forests (complete forest valuation) contribute to SFM?

d) What conclusions can you draw from current funding mechanisms?

e) What suggestions do you have to target funding mechanisms for SFM?

Narrative summary and highlights

39. When discussing the nature of funding for SFM, MG participants highlighted that funding for forest issues is inadequate for the issues at hand. Instead, global funding priorities are focused outside of forests on issues such as climate change, food security and economic growth. They also noted that funding is currently fragmented; that the few funding sources and mechanisms that are available are difficult to access due to bureaucracy, complex application processes and a lack of

transparency; and that there is a need to explore untapped and alternative funding sources, both from outside of the forest sector and from emerging areas of funding opportunities such as REDD+ and various sectors related to SDGs, both at the international and national levels. They also stated that there needs to be a comprehensive valuation of financial mechanisms including a full economic valuation of all ecosystem services and funding sources that take a wider perspective on forest values; as well as a full economic valuation of in-kind contributions to SFM from stakeholders such as communities, Indigenous Peoples and smallholders.

40. Participants noted that there are mechanisms for funding at many different levels that address the issues of forests, including multi-lateral UN funding, bilateral funding, national funding and private sector funding. They highlighted that these are still insufficient to support SFM, and that there is not one general mechanism at the international level that specifically supports implementation processes for SFM. While a Global Forest Fund has been discussed in the UNFF processes, there has been a lack of political will from governments to support the initiative. Concerns were also raised that private company funding often invest in businesses that can be counter-productive to SFM (e.g. oil palm plantations, gold mining etc.)

41. Participants underscored the need to attract new and additional funds for SFM and for strong political will of Member States to prioritize SFM. Initiatives that would support both objectives include: improved forest governance at the community level and in forest institutions; clear and transparent mechanisms for fund allocation; enhanced engagement of MGs in fora, such as the World Business Forum, where they can advocate for direct funding to forests; the development of clear communication advocacy strategies and best practices; capacity building of MGs and community groups on how to fill out complex funding applications; and linking forest initiatives and SFM to climate change, food security and other issues for which significant funds exist. Additional suggestions included performance-based payments and the development of national roadmaps for SFM.

42. Participants stressed that a complete forest valuation must recognize that forests, and the ecosystems they form, comprise a rich wealth of natural capital that sustains both life and economic activity. While there is common understanding, appreciation and measurements for the value of timber, forest carbon and some ecosystem services such as water and eco-tourism, current methodologies that value forests do not give measurable significance to a range of other forest goods and benefits, such as non-timber forest products, food, extractives, pollution control, pollination, watersheds, wind breaks, the nutrient cycle etc. The interdependence and benefits of social, cultural and spiritual connections with forests have also not been sufficiently considered in forest valuation.

Conclusions

43. After reviewing the nature of funding, existing financial mechanisms and their understanding of complete forest valuation, participants made the following conclusions:

a) The lack and inconsistencies of funding mechanisms reflect the lack of political willingness among the governments to prioritize SFM. As a result, funding for SFM is not only extremely fragmented, but the existing funding mechanisms

emphasize more on the economic value and less on the conservation, cultural and social value of forests.

b) A large proportion of existing funds have been spent in bureaucratic processes, leaving less funds available for the implementation of SFM. This makes it difficult for communities to get fair compensation for their efforts in forest protection as well as restoration.

c) Funding mechanisms are varied, complex and confusing, which thereby hinders MGs and communities that depend on forests from accessing funds for SFM.

d) Many big forestry-related industrial enterprises are often not sustainable, particularly from the social and environmental perspectives, and they provide limited support for economic wellbeing of local communities.

e) Good governance at all levels, from national to local, from government to non-government, is crucial not just to attract funding, but to build credibility and efficiency of SFM initiatives.

f) Diversity of funding options, the creation of adaptive capacities, and responsiveness to emerging issues all play an integral part in ensuring sufficient funding mechanisms to meet the needs of SFM and communities who rely on the forests for their survival. Funding of a diversity of interests, from dialogue and policy development to implementation and "on the ground" initiatives, is also key to SFM.

g) There are many opportunities and initiatives nations and communities can undertake that do not require substantial, or any, funding assistance from donors. For example, instituting volunteer programs.

Recommendations

44. The following recommendations were made:

a) The UNFF should set up a strategic trust fund for SFM, which will play a catalytic role to leverage other sources of funding. The new UN body on forests should set up modalities for contributing monies to this strategic trust fund. Seed money from the strategic trust fund should be made available for developing countries to develop their implementation actions.

b) Establish national funds for SFM that can be borne out of mechanisms, such as taxation from forestry related industries, and ensure that the funds are allocated for SFM implementation, capacity-building and technology transfer.

c) Create a financial clearing house of all existing funds on forests to assist in implementing SFM in developing countries. This includes funds not necessarily earmarked specifically for SFM but which have intrinsic ties to forests, such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF). Capacity-building on understanding these funding mechanisms is also required, to provide clarity and accessibility to all stakeholders, and to reduce often lengthy and poorly streamlined application processes and negotiations.

d) The Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) need to simplify their procedures to be more accessible and accountable. The Governors' Climate and Forests Task Force (GCF) Fund needs to

establish a clear and transparent mechanism to enable both government and relevant stakeholders to access the fund.

e) Industrial enterprises and businesses that benefit both directly and indirectly from forests and forestry services need to be required to invest a large proportion of their corporate social responsibility (CSR) funding into SFM initiatives.

3. Topic 3: Enhancing the engagement of Major Groups participation in the UNFF process

Guiding questions

45. The following five questions were posed to guide discussions:

a) Why do we need an effective MG engagement?

b) Why is the current MG engagement not effective?

c) What are the good elements of the current MG engagement?

d) What conclusions can you draw from your understanding of the current MG engagement in the UNFF process?

e) What suggestions do you have for future MG engagement in the new UN body?

Narrative summary and highlights

46. The forest is not only the domain of government but of the peoples and so, for effective SFM, the involvement of all stakeholders is not only needed, but required, when making decisions on forests. Effective MGs engagement is essential as MGs are best positioned to ensure respect for human rights in the policy process; to keep a close watch on decision-making to ensure an inclusive and transparent process; to advocate on behalf of forest stakeholders, particularly communities, as a safeguard against potential negative impacts of international forest initiatives; and to serve as a feedback mechanism and provide interactions in both the top-down and bottom-up processes. They bring diverse perspectives on forests across all sectors, including the perspectives of marginalized voices often neglected at national levels, that range from forest conservation to the extraction of forest resources, and from economic, environmental, social, cultural and spiritual perspectives, all of which are crucial for SFM. MGs also bring legitimacy, collaborations, partnerships and networks that can assist the UNFF to implement actions at regional, national and local levels. And at both the local and national levels, MGs are able to translate what's happening into language that people understand.

47. The effectiveness of MGs engagement is currently hindered by a lack of clear institutional or financial mechanisms for mobilization, coordination and capacity-building; a fragmented, inconsistent communications strategy between MGs as well as a predominantly one-way communication to MGs from the UNFF processes; and the challenges for MGs to build collective consensus and agendas at the regional and international levels. As well, MGs are not collectively reflecting on their strengths and weaknesses. Within the UN system, many governments are not embracing the Agenda 21's provision of MGs engagement and don't understand the value and role of MGs. MGs status is limited to being observers; they can only give

recommendations that may be watered down or even disappear entirely from reports because they have no decision-making capacity in the discussions; and often do not have access to financial resources.

48. The establishment of MGPoF has developed an increased capacity, effectiveness and coordination for MGs in the UNFF process. Its efforts have led directly to the provision of constructive MGs inputs into UNFF processes; a platform for participants' sharing of experiences; a knowledge base on UNFF processes so MGs are better able to participate; an unprecedented agreement whereby Major Groups-Led Initiative reports and joint papers become official UNFF documents; and a growing recognition by many governments that MGPoF is the MGs stakeholder coordination in the UNFF. MGs involvement in side events and intersessional activities that create an environment of engagement have also increased.

Conclusions

49. Discussions on effective MGs engagement, and its current achievements and challenges, led to the following conclusions:

a) MGs engagement is crucial to ensuring that all perspectives, aspirations and voices are considered in the UNFF process. They also play a critical role in implementation, reporting and monitoring to fill the gaps between the global and local processes.

b) During UNFF processes, cooperation and coordination among MGs has drastically improved. For example, MGI Workshops to provide constructive inputs and guidance to the UNFF processes; and MG joint papers that become official UNFF documents. Many governments recognize the importance of MGs and are willing to explore how this could be enhanced.

c) Interventions of MGs have been watered down and sometimes are not reflected in the final reports and decisions. That limits the role of the MGs to "really" engage and have "real" dialogue and "real" discussions instead of just being a tokenism that does not reflect rightfully or recognize the contributions that the MGs have made in the UNFF processes.

d) While there were good intentions for establishing UNFF within ECOSOC, its rules and status limits the ability of MGs to be fully engaged and inhibits the mobilization of other relevant civil society groups in the UNFF process.

e) Currently, there are no incentives for the Major Group of Business and Industry to engage with other MGs.

f) The interest and commitment of MGs to participate in both the policy dialogue and in the implementation of the recommendations of the UNFF is strong.

Recommendations

50. The following recommendations were made:

a) Recognize MGPoF as a legitimate coordinating body for Major Groups involvement in UNFF processes; grant it official Permanent Observer Status in the post-UNFF process; and make MGs true partners.

b) At the global, regional and national levels, any working groups, task forces, delegations or other mechanisms addressing SFM issues must have MGs representation to ensure their meaningful, full and effective engagement. Involve MG representatives in policy development, planning, implementation, reviews and other important decision-making processes.

c) Financial support for MGs involvement in post-UNFF processes must be increased. This should include core funding for MGPoF.

d) MGPoF should be granted the status of Observer on the CPF, and a cooperation and collaboration mechanism between CPF and MGPoF should be supported.

e) MGs should have representation on the governing body on the new UN institution.

f) An independent mechanism for registering MGs wishing to participate in a session should be created to avoid the limitations imposed by following the ECOSOC accreditation process.

g) Communications within, and from, the UNFF Secretariat need to be strengthened, particularly with regards to understanding and championing the role of MGs.

Key recommendations (communiqué)

51. The participants in the workshop issued a communiqué in which they underscored the contributions that sustainable management of forests can make in overcoming the crises of climate change, water shortages and loss of diversity. They also highlighted the importance of the active involvement of civil society groups in seeking and implementing solutions to the local and global crises we all face. The communiqué then outlined 6 of the key conclusions and 9 of the key recommendations that were agreed upon at the Workshop. The full communiqué is appended as an Annex and is also available at www.mgp-forests.org.

Closing ceremony

52. The official closing ceremony was held on the afternoon of Friday, 6 March 2015. Mr. Lambert Okrah officially commenced the ceremony by reading the workshop communiqué (see para. 51 above) for the assembled delegates and journalists. Following the presentation of the communiqué, the MGs were encouraged to continue in earnest their work in contributing to the UNFF. Participants were also reminded that this workshop was simply one step in an important ongoing journey.

53. Representing the Workshop's Organizing Committee, Mr. Joseph Cobbinah, Chair of the Board of MGPoF, formally thanked the Government of Nepal for hosting the workshop, Mr. Ghan Shyam Pandey and his staff for their administrative and organizational support, and the German Government for sponsoring. He also expressed deep gratitude to the UNFF Secretariat and ITTO for their administrative support, to the hospitality of the Nepalese people and to all the participants for their meaningful contributions to the success of the workshop. Mr. Cobbinah closed by thanking Lambert Okrah for his contributions and leadership, without whom the workshop would not have been realized.

54. In the official closing address by Mr. Sharad Chandra Paudel, Secretary, Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation, Government of Nepal shared his appreciation of the scope and scale of the workshop, and of the work undertaken and outcomes that resulted. In particular, he was pleased that everyone had had the opportunity to visit several Community Forest projects and have first-hand experience seeing how Nepalese people are engaged in the management of forests and SFM. Mr. Paudel stressed that we need to highlight and champion the interdependence of the sustainable use of forests and development, not only for the UN system's realization of the SDGs, but also to ensure the continued subsistence of humans around the world. He assured the participants that, as the hosting country, Nepal will submit the final report to the UN Secretary-General so that the recommendations will be given the serious considerations they deserve during UNFF11. He wished the participants a safe trip home, and hoped they enjoyed their stay in Kathmandu.

55. The workshop was officially closed with short closing remarks by Mr. Lambert Okrah who thanked all participants, and in particular, the focal points and organizing committee who worked hard for a successful event. After wishing everyone a safe journey back, and a reminder that UNFF11 is where the work really begins, he declared the workshop officially closed.

Annex 1

Communiqué on a Major Groups Workshop developing recommendations for UNFF11

6 March 2015

From 2-6 March, 2015, Major Groups Partnership on Forests (MGPoF), the coordinating organization of Major Groups involved in the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) process, organized a five day international workshop, hosted by the government of Nepal, on one of the major issues of our time: Sustainable Forests Management.

Climate change, water shortages for drinking and irrigation, and loss of biodiversity are huge challenges for our planet Earth. Sustainable management of forests can make a big contribution to overcoming these crises.

As part of our five-day conference, we visited three Community Forests here in Nepal where we saw for ourselves how local communities are restoring forests, increasing water supplies and protecting wildlife.

Civil society in Nepal includes many representatives of Major Groups. Many are essential participants in the work of the Community Forests we visited. They are demonstrating the importance of the active involvement of women, youth, small farmers and local authorities with support from scientific research institutions, labour and environmental organizations.

Without the leadership of the communities and the support of government and other organizations, the benefits from sustainable forest management would not happen. We saw this for ourselves here in Nepal. We can tell you this is also true around the world. When civil society groups are actively involved, there are solutions to the local and global crises we all face.

The workshop brought together 76 participants from 36 countries representing the following 8 of the 9 official Major Groups identified by the United Nations: Women; Children and Youth; Scientific and Technological community; Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs); Indigenous Peoples; Workers and Trade Unions; Farmers and Small Forests Landowners; and Local Authorities.

The theme of the workshop was "*Sustainable Forest Management: Designing the Vehicles for Securing the Means of Implementation*". Discussions focused on three themes: the new United Nations body for Sustainable Forests Management (SFM); financial mechanisms for undertaking SFM; and enhancing the engagement of Major Groups participation in the UNFF process.

Under the first theme of a new global body for SFM, to replace the UNFF that will soon be concluding its mandate, participants concluded that:

- The UNFF's placement within ECOSOC has led to a rich dialogue that resulted in more than 270 recommendations, but it does not provide scope or capacity for implementation. The present hierarchy and complexity within ECOSOC at the divisional level hinders decision-making as bureaucracy is very high. Major Groups want to see more focus on implementation of the forest instrument and goals on forests.

- There is a lack of ownership of UNFF recommendations, as seen in some of the language used that asks Parties to "consider" and "encourage" but does not call on Parties to "commit". With clauses of "national limitations and territorial sovereignty" the Parties are more reluctant to take on recommendations that might be too ambitious.

and made the following recommendations:

- We propose a new multi-stakeholder UN Forest Organization, not under ECOSOC, that addresses both policy and implementation, and that will deal with forestry issues in a coordinated and holistic manner at the global, regional, national and local levels.
- The issue of forests is included in several of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs, goals 6, 15 and 17). The new UN body on forests should be responsible for the high political level dialogue on SDGs on forest related issues, including the review of policies and the establishment of dedicated funds to implement its work on the ground. The new body should also be responsible for coordinating all institutions and mechanisms engaged on forest issues within the UN.
- Major Groups need to be part of the governing structure of the new UN body on forests.

For the second theme of financial mechanisms for undertaking SFM, participants concluded that:

- The lack and inconsistencies of funding mechanisms reflect the lack of political willingness among the governments to prioritize SFM. As a result, funding for SFM is not only extremely fragmented but the existing funding mechanisms emphasize more on economic value and less on the conservation, cultural and social value of forests.
- A large proportion of existing funds have been spent in bureaucratic processes, leaving less funds available for the implementation of SFM. This makes it difficult for communities to get fair compensation for their efforts in forest protection as well as restoration.

and made the following recommendations:

- The UNFF should set up a strategic trust fund for SFM, which will play a catalytic role to leverage other sources of funding. The new UN body on forests should set up modalities for contributing monies to this strategic trust fund. Seed money from the strategic trust fund should be made available for developing countries to develop their implementation actions.
- Establish national funds for SFM that can be borne out of mechanisms, such as taxation from forestry related industries, and ensure that the funds are allocated for SFM implementation, capacity-building and technology transfer.
- Create a financial clearing house of all existing funds on forests to assist in implementing SFM in developing countries.

On the issue of enhancing the engagement of Major Groups participation in the UNFF process, participants concluded that:

- During UNFF processes, cooperation and coordination among Major Groups has drastically improved. For example, workshops to provide constructive inputs and guidance to the UNFF processes; and Major Group joint papers that become official UNFF documents. Many governments recognize the importance of Major Groups and are willing to explore how this could be enhanced
- Interventions of Major Groups have been watered down and sometimes are not reflected in the final reports and decisions. That limits the role of the Major Groups to "really" engage and have "real" dialogue and "real" discussions instead of just being a tokenism that does not reflect rightfully or recognize the contributions that the Major Groups have made in the UNFF processes;

and made the following recommendations:

- Recognize MGPoF as a legitimate coordinating body for Major Groups involvement in post-UNFF processes. Give MGPoF official Permanent Observer Status in the post-UNFF process; and make Major Groups true partners in the full process of the realization of actions.
- At the global, regional and national levels, any working groups, task forces or other mechanisms addressing SFM issues must have Major Groups representation to ensure their meaningful, full and effective engagement. Involve Major Groups representatives in review processes and other important decision-making processes.
- Financial support for Major Groups involvement in post-UNFF processes should be increased. This should include funds for the MGPoF to do its work and successfully implement its institutional goals.

Annex 2

List of workshop participants

♦ **Krishna Acharya**
Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation
➢ Nepal
✉ kpacharya1@hotmail.com

♦ **Pradip Acharya**
Construction and Allied Workers Union Nepal (CAWUN)
➢ Nepal
✉ cawun_nepal@yahoo.com
✉ acharyapradip6120@gmail.com
MG: Wood Workers & Trade Unions

♦ **Shankar Adhikari**
University of Melbourne
➢ Australia
✉ adhikarishankar@gmail.com
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Adejoke Olukemi Akinyele**
Dept. of Forest Resources Management, University of Ibadan
➢ Nigeria
✉ akinyelejo@yahoo.co.uk
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Mohammed Al-Amin**
Institute of Forestry and Environmental Sciences (IFES)
➢ Bangladesh
✉ prof.alamin@yahoo.com
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Khoirul Anam**
KAHUTINDO (Indonesian Forestry and Allied Workers' Union)
➢ Indonesia
✉ kahutindo1@yahoo.com
MG: Wood Workers & Trade Unions

♦ **Joshua Ansah**
Timber and Wood Workers' Union of GTUC
➢ Ghana
✉ ansah_joshua@yahoo.com
MG: Wood Workers & Trade Unions

♦ **Marcial Arias**
International Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of Tropical Forest
➢ Panama
✉ ariasmarcial@gmail.com
MG: Indigenous Peoples

♦ **Uyi Asemota**
International Forestry Students' Association (IFSA)
➢ Ghana
✉ uyi.ifsa@gmail.com
MG: Children & Youth

♦ **Lieneke Bakker**
Major Groups Partnership on Forests (MGPoF)
➢ Canada
✉ lieneke@mgp-forests.org

♦ **Kiran Baram**
National Federation of Indigenous Nationalties of Nepal
➢ Nepal
✉ baramkiran@gmail.com
MG: Indigenous Peoples

♦ **Dasharathi Behera**
Odisha Jungle Mancha (OJM)
➢ India
✉ kjsmbpt@rediffmail.com
✉ odishajunglemancha@yahoo.in
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Ashok Benzy**
Municipality association of Nepal
➢ Nepal
MG: Local Authorities

♦ **Robby Vivian Berenstein**
Progressive Trade Union Federation 47, Abbrevation: C-47
➢ Suriname
✉ robby.berenstein@hotmail.com
✉ vakcentrale47@gmail.com
MG: Wood Workers & Trade Unions

♦ **Kabindra Bhatta**
National Forum for Advocacy Nepal
➢ Nepal
✉ kabindrabhatta17@yahoo.com
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Lynn Broughton**
Broughton Communications
➢ Canada
✉ lynn@ broughtoncommunications.ca

♦ **Sairusi Bulai**
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
➢ Fiji
✉ sairusib@spc.int
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Jeffrey Campbell**
Food & Agriculture Organization (FAO)
➢ Italy
✉ jeffrey.campbell@fao.org
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Ben Chikamai**
Kenya Forestry Research Insitute
➢ Kenya
✉ director@kefri.org
✉ benchikamai@ngara.org
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Mafa E. Chipeta**
Development on call
➢ Malawi
✉ emchipeta@gmail.com

♦ **Joseph Cobbinah**
Forestry Network of Sub-Saharan Africa
➢ Ghana
✉ joe.cobbinah@ymail.com
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Zain Daudpoto**
Indus Development Organization (IDO)
➢ Pakistan
✉ zaindp@gmail.com
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Peter DeMarsh**
Canadian Federation of Woodlot Owners
➢ Canada
✉ grandpic@nbnet.nb.ca
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Hari Dhungana**
Southasia Institute of Advanced Studies
➢ Nepal
✉ hari@sias-southasia.org
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Ilia Domashov**
Ecological Movement "BIOM"
➢ Kyrgyzstan
✉ idomashov@gmail.com
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Archana Godbole**
Applied Environmental Research Foundation
➢ India
✉ archanagodbole@aerfindia.org
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Sim Heok-Choh**
Asia Pacific Association of Forestry Research Institutions
➢ Malaysia
✉ sim@apafri.org
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Nimal Hewanila**
Nirmanee Development Foundation
➢ Sri Lanka
✉ flink@sltnet.lk
MG: Indigenous Peoples

♦ **Adolfo Andres Hincapie Garcia**
Organización Indígena de Antioquia
➢ Colombia
✉ aahincap@unal.edu.co
MG: Indigenous Peoples

♦ **Christian Holz**
University of Ottawa
➢ Canada
✉ cholz@climate.works

♦ **Steven Johnson**
International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)
➢ Japan
✉ johnson@itto.int

♦ **P. Kandel**
➢ Nepal

♦ **Edna Kaptoyo**
International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests (IAITPTF) / Indigenous Information Network
➢ Kenya
✉ kaptoyoedna@gmail.com
MG: Indigenous Peoples

♦ **Njeri Kariuki**
UNFF Secretariat
➢ USA
✉ kariuki@un.org

♦ **Ganesh Karki**
Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN)
➢ Nepal
✉ karkign@gmail.com
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Prajual Karki**
Major Groups Partnership on Forests (MGPoF)
➢ Canada
✉ prajual@mgp-forests.org

♦ **Gertrude Kabusimbi Kenyangi**
Support for Women in Agriculture and Environment
➢ Uganda
✉ ruralwomenug@yahoo.com
MG: Women

♦ **Dil Raj Khanal**
Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN)
➢ Nepal
✉ dlkhanal@yahoo.com
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Ken Kinney**
The Development Institute
➢ Ghana
✉ kkinney@thedevin.org
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Andrey Laletin**
Friends of the Siberian Forests
➢ Russian Federation
✉ laletin3@gmail.com
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Kanchan Lama**
Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture & Natural Resource Management (WOCAN)
➢ Nepal
✉ kanchan.lama01@gmail.com
MG: Women

♦ **Florentino Mabras**
MASAU (Mapapa, Sta. Maria, Aurora) Forest Land Occupants Association
➢ Philippines
✉ sangguniangbayan479@yahoo.com
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Tatenda Mapeto**
International Forestry Students' Association (IFSA)
➢ South Africa
✉ tatenda.ifsa@gmail.com
MG: Children & Youth

♦ **Djordje Maric**
Trade union of Forest estate "Uzice"
➢ Serbia
✉ djole31@gmail.com
MG: Wood Workers & Trade Unions

♦ **Fiu Mata'ese Elisara-La'ulu**
Global Justice Ecology / Ole Siosiomaga Society Incorporated (OLSSI)
➢ Samoa
✉ fiuelisara51@yahoo.com
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Sylvia Mayta**
International Forestry Students' Association (IFSA)
➢ Peru
✉ sylviamayta@yahoo.com
MG: Children & Youth

♦ **Pacifique Mukumba Isumbisho**
Centre d'Accompagnement des Autochtones Pygmées et Minoritaires Vulnérables (CAMV)
➢ Democratic Republic of Congo
✉ mukumbapaci@yahoo.ca
MG: Indigenous Peoples

♦ **John Nagella**
Association for Rivers and Coastal-Ecosystems Conservation
➢ India
✉ arcceco@gmail.com
MG: Indigenous Peoples

♦ **Cécile Ndjebet**
REFACOF (African Women's Network for Community Management of Forests)
➢ Cameroon
✉ cecilendjebet28@gmail.com
✉ cndjebet@yahoo.com
MG: Women

♦ **Milagre Nuvunga**
Fundacao MICAIA
➢ Mozambique
✉ Milagre@micaia.org
MG: Women

♦ **Lambert Okrah**
Major Groups Partnership on Forests (MGPoF)
➢ Canada
✉ lambert@mgp-forests.org

♦ **Bamidele Oni**
International Forestry Students' Association (IFSA)
➢ Nigeria
✉ bamideleoni.greenimpact@gmail.com
MG: Children & Youth

♦ **Patrice Andre Pa'ah**
Cooperative Agro Forestiere de la Trinationale
➢ Cameroon
✉ caft.cameroun@gmail.com
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Jekk Mickale Paderes**
International Forestry Students' Association (IFSA)
➢ Philippines
✉ jekkpaderes@gmail.com
MG: Children & Youth

♦ **Ghan Shyam Pandey**
Global Alliance of Community Forestry
➢ Nepal
✉ pandeygs2002@yahoo.com
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Rita Parajuli**
Green Foundation Nepal
➢ Nepal
✉ ritaparajuli.env@gmail.com
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Bharati Pathak**
Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN)
➢ Nepal
✉ bharatipathak_2006@yahoo.com
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Bhola Prasad Bhattarai**
Forest Environment Workers Union Nepal (FEWUN)
➢ Nepal
✉ forestunion12@gmail.com
MG: Wood Workers & Trade Unions

♦ **Mrinalini Rai**
Global Forest Coalition
➢ Thailand
✉ mrinalini.rai@globalforestcoalition.org
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Narendra Kumar Rai**
Ashok Sansthan
➢ India
✉ ashoksansthan@yahoo.co.in
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Daniele Ramiaramanana**
National Research Center Applied for Rural Development (FOFIFA)
➢ Madagascar
✉ fofifa_fnr@yahoo.fr
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Hubertus Samangan**
ICTI-Tanimbar
➢ Indonesia
✉ hsamangun@yahoo.com
MG: Indigenous Peoples

♦ **Olivia Sanchez**
International Forestry Students' Association (IFSA)
➢ Mexico
✉ olivia.ifsa@gmail.com
MG: Children & Youth

♦ **Samuel Secaira**
Asociación Vivamos Mejor Guatemala / Universidad del Valle de Guatemala
➢ Guatemala
✉ samuelsecaira@hotmail.com
MG: Scientific & Technological Community

♦ **Abidah Setyowati**
Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture & Natural Resource Management (WOCAN)
➢ Indonesia
✉ abidahbillah@gmail.com
MG: Women

♦ **Manohari Siwakoti**
Central Union Of Painters, Plumbers, Electro and Construction Workers (CUPPEC)
➢ Nepal
✉ cuppec@gefont.org
✉ siwakoti_manohari@yahoo.com
MG: Wood Workers & Trade Unions

♦ **Manoel Sobral Filho**
UNFF Secretariat
➢ USA
✉ unff@un.org

♦ **Somying Soontornwong**
Thailand Community Forestry National Networks of CSOs / RECOFTC-The Center for People and Forests
➢ Thailand
✉ somying.s@gmail.com
✉ somying@recoftc.org
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Anup Srivastava**
Building and Wood Workers International (BWI)
➢ India
✉ anup.srivastava@bwint.org
MG: Wood Workers & Trade Unions

♦ **Anna Stemberger**
International Forestry Students' Association (IFSA)
➢ Canada
✉ annastem.ifsa@gmail.com
MG: Children & Youth

♦ **Khalil Walji**
International Forestry Students Association (IFSA)
➢ Canada
✉ khalilwalji@gmail.com
MG: Children & Youth

♦ **Dominic Walubengo**
Forest Action Network
➢ Kenya
✉ waluwande@gmail.com
✉ DWalubengo@fankenya.org
MG: Farmers & Small Forests Landowners

♦ **Michael Wanyonyi**
Groundwork Environmental Initiatives
➢ Kenya
✉ michaelsingoro@yahoo.com
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Maria Cristina Weyland Vieira**
Brazilian Confederation of Private Nature Reserves
➢ Brazil
✉ mcwvieira@gmail.com
MG: Non-Governmental Organizations

♦ **Rulita Wijayaningdyah**
KAHUTINDO (Indonesian Forestry and Allied Workers' Union)
➢ Indonesia
✉ kahutindo3@yahoo.com
✉ lithacantik@gmail.com
MG: Wood Workers & Trade Unions

♦ **Sekar Ayu Woro Yunita**
International Forestry Students' Association (IFSA)
➢ Indonesia
✉ sekarayunita@gmail.com
MG: Children & Youth